

1 KEKER & VAN NEST, LLP
2 JOHN W. KEKER - #49092
2 MICHAEL H. PAGE - #154913
3 710 Sansome Street
3 San Francisco, CA 94111-1704
4 Telephone: (415) 391-5400
4 Facsimile: (415) 397-7188

5 DERWIN & SIEGEL
6 DOUGLAS K. DERWIN - #111407
6 3280 Alpine Road
7 Portola Valley, CA 94028
7 Telephone: (650)529-8700
8 Facsimile: (650) 529-8799

9 INTERTRUST TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION
9 MARK SCADINA - #173103
10 JEFF McDOW - #184727
10 4800 Patrick Henry Drive
11 Santa Clara, CA 95054
11 Telephone: (408) 855-0100
12 Facsimile: (408) 855-0144

13 Attorneys for Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant
13 INTERTRUST TECHNOLOGIES CORPORATION

14

15 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
16 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

18 INTERTRUST TECHNOLOGIES
19 CORPORATION, a Delaware corporation,

Case No. C 01-1640 SBA (MEJ)

Consolidated with C 02-0647 SBA

20 Plaintiff,
21 v.
22 MICROSOFT CORPORATION, a
22 Washington corporation,
23 Defendant.

**PATENT LOCAL RULE 4-3 JOINT
CLAIM CONSTRUCTION AND
PREHEARING STATEMENT**

24 AND COUNTER ACTION.

26
27
28

1 Plaintiff and Counter-Defendant Intertrust Technologies Corporation ("Intertrust") and
2 Defendant and Counter-Claimant Microsoft Corporation ("Microsoft") submit the following
3 Joint Claim Construction and Prehearing Statement in accordance with Patent Local Rule 4-3.

4 **RULE 4-3(a) and (b)**

5 Claim terms and phrases on which the parties agree are listed at the beginning of Exhibit
6 B, attached.

7 **RULE 4-3(b)**

8 Attached hereto as Exhibit A is Microsoft's presentation of disputed claim terms
9 and Microsoft's proposed constructions. Attached hereto as Exhibit B is InterTrust's
10 presentation of disputed claim terms and InterTrust's proposed constructions. The parties are
11 discussing a joint presentation that would present each party's position on all disputed terms in a
12 side-by-side format. If the parties reach agreement on such a submission, the parties will provide
13 that submission to the Court as a substitute for the attached Exhibits A and B.

14 Attached hereto as Exhibit C is InterTrust's identification of intrinsic and
15 extrinsic evidence supporting InterTrust's proposed construction for each disputed term and
16 phrase.

17 Attached hereto as Exhibit D is Microsoft's identification of intrinsic and
18 extrinsic evidence supporting Microsoft's proposed construction for each disputed term and
19 phrase.

20 Attached hereto as Exhibit E is a Microsoft statement of reservations.

21 **RULE 4-3(c)**

22 The Court has set aside three days for the Claim Construction Hearing.

23 **RULE 4-3(d)**

24 Attached hereto as Exhibit F is a summary of expert testimony to be presented by
25 InterTrust. Attached hereto as Exhibit G is a summary of expert testimony to be presented by
26 Microsoft.

27 **RULE 4-3(e)**

28 Following is a list of other issues the parties believe might appropriately be taken

1 up at the Case Management Conference hearing set for February 13, or such other prehearing
2 conference as the Court may wish to schedule. Substantive argument on these issues is set forth
3 in the Joint Case Management Conference Statement filed concurrently herewith.

4 A. Issues upon which the parties agree:

5

6 1. Live expert testimony should not be presented. Each party will undertake its best
7 efforts to have its above-designated expert(s) present at the hearing to respond to
8 questions from the Court.

9

10 2. Each party will undertake its best efforts to have its declarants available for deposition
11 within one week of submitting Claim Construction or indefiniteness summary judgment
12 declarations.

13

14 3. Normal briefing page limits should be doubled for the Claim Construction briefs.

15

16 4. There will be no post-hearing briefing, except at the request of the Court.

17 B. Issues which the parties agree should be taken up at the Case Management Conference, but as
18 to which the parties do not agree on substance:

19 1. The number of claim construction briefs to be filed by the parties.

20 2. Format of the Claim Construction Hearing.

21 a. Whether the parties should present tutorials, and, if so, the length and format of
22 such a tutorial.

23 b. Whether the parties should present a non-tutorial opening statement.

24 c. The format and ordering of substantive argument on disputed claim language.

25 d. Whether the currently scheduled Mini-Markman proceeding should be devoted
26 to all of the disputed terms and phrases from the 12 selected patent claims, or a
27 subset.

28

3. Whether other issues should be addressed during the Claim Construction Hearing.
 - a. The anticipated Microsoft motion for summary judgment of indefiniteness, referenced in the Court's Further Case Management Order of November 6, 2002.
 - b. Whether certain material said to be "incorporated by reference" into several of the asserted patents, does or does not constitute part of the "specification" of those patents for claim construction purposes.
 - c. Other evidentiary disputes related to the Claim Construction Hearing.

9 C. Issues Microsoft intends to raise at the Case Management Conference, but which InterTrust
10 believes are not appropriate for that conference:

11 1. Claim construction and claim indefiniteness discovery disputes.
12 2. The scope of the stay entered by the court.

Dated: February 3, 2003

Respectfully submitted,

KEKER & VAN NEST, LLP

20 Dated: February 3, 2003

ORRICK HERRINGTON & SUTCLIFFE

23
24 ERIC L. WESENBERG
Attorneys for Microsoft Corporation